

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated September 13, 2010. Claims 1-18 and 20-35 currently stand rejected. As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken in any proper combination. No new matter has been added by the amendment. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

A. The Objection to Claim 21 is Overcome.

Claim 21 is objected to for informalities relating to the expression "parser or generator." Applicants have addressed the objections via responsive amendments to claim 21 to clarify the objectionable aspects. Accordingly, the objection to claim 21 is overcome.

B. Provisional Double Patenting with respect to Claims 1 and 18.

The Office Action provisionally rejects claim 1 and 18 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Application No. 10/574,727 (hereinafter "the '727 application"). Applicants have noted the provisional rejection and respectfully request that the provisional rejection be held in abeyance until such time that the present application or the '727 application issues as a patent.

C. Claims 1-8, 10, 18, 21-27, and 29 are Nonobvious.

Claims 1-8, 10, 18, 21-27, and 29 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 03/014971 to Langer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0079052 to Kushnirsky. However, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims and the claimed invention is not an obvious variant of the cited combination.

Independent claim 1, and similarly independent claim 18, recite, one form or another, "wherein said generic data supplier API configures the device to... **decouple said parsers or generators from said at least one data source.**" This concept of "decoupling" is explained in the specification of the published application at least at paragraph [0055]. Paragraph [0055] states (emphasis added):

The mark-up language parser or generator accesses data from a source using the extensible framework--i.e. a generic data supplier API. **Hence, the parser or generator is insulated from having to talk directly to a data source;** instead, it does so via the generic data supplier API, acting as an intermediary layer. **This de-couples the parser or generator from the data source** and hence means that the parser or generator no longer have to be hard coded for a specific data supplier. This in turn leads to a simplification of the parser and generator design.

As such, the concept of decoupling involves using the data supplier API to configure the device as an isolation conduit or middleman that insulates the parser or generator from direct interaction with the data source.

For allegedly teaching or suggesting this element, the Office Action relies on an excerpt from Langer (page 7 lines 4-5) that states, "Another advantage of the framework is its modularity. Every block implementation can be easily **plugged in and out** of the system." The Office Action specifically relies on this ability of Langer's components to be plugged in and out as allegedly reading on the "decoupling" aspect of the claims.

However, it is clear that these two concepts are quite different. As indicated above, decoupling within the context of the claims addresses the ability of the data supplier API to configure the device in such a way as to insulate the parsers and generators from the data source. In contrast, the ability of Langer's system to plug components of the system in and out merely addresses the modular configurability of the general system and bears no relationship to the operation of any one component as being configured to insulate two entities from each other, as described with respect to the data supplier API of the claims.

As such, when the claims are read in light of the specification, simply indicating that components may be plugged in and out does not correlate to the concept of decoupling. Further, since this concept of decoupling is not taught or suggested by Langer's description of components being capable of being plugged in and out, this feature of the claims is left unaddressed by the Office Action. The cited portions of Langer, as well as the remainder of Langer, merely indicates that parser plug-ins may be used to support different languages and protocols. There is no disclosure relating to the decoupling of the parser from the data source via the operation of an application programming interface. Additionally, Kushnirskiy does not cure this deficiency, nor is Kushnirskiy cited for this purpose.

As such, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest all of the features of the independent claims, and therefore the independent claims and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the cited combination. The rejection of claims 1-8, 10, 18, 21-27, and 29 should therefore be withdrawn.

E. Claims 11-13, 15-17, 20, 30-32, and 34-35 are Nonobvious.

Claims 11-13, 15-17, 20, 30-32, and 34-35 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer and Kushnirskiy in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0172348 to Fry. However, the cited combination relies upon Langer and Kushnirskiy for disclosing the same features as described above with respect to the rejection of the independent claims. Since Langer and Kushnirskiy fail in this regard, and Fry does not cure the deficiencies of Langer and Kushnirskiy (nor is Fry cited for this purpose), dependent claims 11-13, 15-17, 20, 30-32, and 34-35 are patentable over the cited combination due at least to the failures of Langer and Kushnirskiy. The rejections of claims 11-13, 15-17, 20, 30-32, and 34-35 are therefore overcome.

F. Claims 14 and 33 are Nonobvious.

Claims 14 and 33 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer, Kushnirskiy, and Fry, in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0237050 to Davidov. However, the cited combination relies upon Langer and Kushnirskiy for disclosing the same features as described above with respect to the rejection of the independent claims. Since Langer and Kushnirskiy fail in this regard, and Fry and Davidov do not cure the deficiencies of Langer and Kushnirskiy (nor are Fry and Davidov cited for this purpose), dependent claims 14 and 33 are patentable over the cited combination due at least to the failures of Langer and Kushnirskiy. The rejections of claims 14 and 33 are therefore overcome.

G. Claims 9 and 28 are Nonobvious.

Claims 9 and 28 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer and Kushnirskiy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,637 to Cable. However, the cited combination relies upon Langer and Kushnirskiy for disclosing the same features as described above with respect to the rejection of the independent claims. Since Langer and Kushnirskiy fail

Appl. No.: 10/574,728
Amdt. dated 01/13/2010
Reply to Office Action of 09/13/2010

in this regard, and Cable does not cure the deficiencies of Langer and Kushnirskiy (nor is Cable cited for this purpose), dependent claims 9 and 28 are patentable over the cited combination due at least to the failures of Langer and Kushnirskiy. The rejections of claims 9 and 28 are therefore overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Quirk
Registration No. 60,676

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON **JANUARY 13, 2011**.